

UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

09/283,958

04/01/99

RAYMOND

R

98-075-TAP

WM01/0329

TIMOTHY R SCHULTE STORAGE TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION 2270 SOUTH 88TH STREET MS 4309 LOUISVILLE CO 80028-4309

EXAMINER

LETSCHER, G

PAPER NUMBER

2652

DATE MAILED: 03/29/01

ART UNIT

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Application No.

George Letscher

09/283,958

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Group Art Unit 2652

Raymond et al



Office Action Summary

X Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 9, 2001	
★ This action is FINAL.	
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expis longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to re application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).	spond within the period for response will cause the
Disposition of Claims	
	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
	is/are rejected.
Claim(s)	
☐ Claims	
Application Papers See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).	
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been	
_ received.	
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)	
received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
*Certified copies not received:	
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).	
Attachment(s)	
Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Notice of References Cited, PTO-1440, Page Note: Note	
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).	
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948	
☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES	

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 50-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray et al (EP 727772)in view of Kaaden et al (US 5,978,188) and Miyauchi et al (US 5,274,521).

The aforementioned claims set forth the following features, inter alia, disclosed in Gray et al '772: a magnetic recording head having a plurality of thin film elements, each element having a yoke with front and back regions

alternately positioned on each side of a position line, each yoke formed on a substrate; a position line normal to the media direction; each gap of the thin film elements having a gap angle with the position line and opposite the gap angle of the adjacent gap angle; a conductive coil having a plurality of loops, each loop having a portion passing within the yoke and encircling the lower yoke section; see Figures 2, 5 and 7 of Gray et al '772.

Regarding claims 50, 62 and 71, Gray et al '772 do not teach a first plurality of write elements having their back regions on a first side of a position line and a second plurality of write elements on a second side of the position line opposite the first side.

Regarding claims 53, 55, 65 and 79-80, Gray et al '772 do not show a flux sensing read element being located between the yokes of the head.

Kaaden et al '188 disclose a magnetic head assembly (5) having a first plurality of write elements (7) having their back regions on a first side of a position line, e.g., matrix (8), and a second plurality of write elements (7) on a second side of the position line opposite the first side. See Figures 1-2 of Kaaden et al '188 which shows the position (matrix) lines having write elements on either side of the line which splits the head write elements.

Miyauchi et al '521 show a magnetic head having a read element (36) which is within the yoke (53) beneath the gap.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to furnish the magnetic head assembly of Gray et al '772 with a flux sensing read element being located between the yokes of the

r,

head as shown in Miyauchi et al '521. The rationale is as follows: one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to furnish a flux sensing read element being located between the yokes of the head as shown in Miyauchi et al '521 since one of ordinary skill would have operated the MR portion of the device with good linearity and high sensitivity characteristics.

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments filed 1/9/01 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Examiner has applied Kaaden et al '188 along with Gray et al '772 and Mayauchi et al in response to the amended portions of the claims regarding the position line.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment, including new claims 50-82, necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the

advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Letscher whose telephone number is (703) 305-7912.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

George Letscher

March 26, 2001

George Letscher Primary Examiner

AU 2652